

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Magdalena Azmitia	Team: Squad #3	CCRB Case #: 201906935	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Friday, 07/26/2019 11:40 PM	Location of Incident: Woodycrest Avenue and West 167th Street	Precinct: 44	18 Mo. SOL 1/26/2021	EO SOL 9/12/2021	
Date/Time CV Reported	CV Reported At: Precinct	How CV Reported: In-person	Date/Time Received at CCRB Tue, 08/06/2019 11:06 AM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM Jorge Flores	07680	954816	044 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. POM Vincent Mauro	18615	958892	044 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Jorge Flores	Abuse: Police Officer Jorge Flores stopped § 87(2)(b)	
B.POM Jorge Flores	Abuse: Police Officer Jorge Flores threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)	
C.POM Jorge Flores	Abuse: Police Officer Jorge Flores searched § 87(2)(b)	
D.POM Jorge Flores	Abuse: Police Officer Jorge Flores damaged § 87(2)(b)'s property.	
E.POM Jorge Flores	Abuse: Police Officer Jorge Flores did not obtain medical treatment for § 87(2)(b)	
F.POM Jorge Flores	Abuse: Police Officer Jorge Flores refused to provide his name to § 87(2)(b)	
G.POM Jorge Flores	Abuse: Police Officer Jorge Flores failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.	

Case Summary

On July 27, 2019, § 87(2)(b) and her mother § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint in person at the 44th Precinct stationhouse. § 87(2)(b) was a reporting non-witness. The complaint was forwarded to the CCRB and to IAB, generating log #19-28930 [BR 01].

On July 27, 2019, at approximately 11:40 PM, § 87(2)(b) was walking on West 167th Street between Anderson Avenue and Woodycrest Avenue in the Bronx when she stopped next to a car to allegedly take something out of her bag and urinate. PO Jorge Flores of the 44th Precinct, who was driving by with his partner PO Vincent Mauro of the same command, stopped § 87(2)(b) (**Allegation A, Abuse of Authority:** § 87(2)(g) § 87(2)(b) fled from PO Flores, who ran after her towards Woodycrest Avenue. While § 87(2)(b) was running across Woodycrest Avenue, an oncoming vehicle struck her. § 87(2)(b) stopped on the opposite corner of West 167th Street and Woodycrest Avenue, where PO Flores allegedly stated that he was going to arrest § 87(2)(b) for tampering with a car (**Allegation B, Abuse of Authority:** § 87(2)(g) PO Flores allegedly searched § 87(2)(b)'s bag by turning it upside down and spilling the contents onto the sidewalk, allegedly resulting in damage to her phone screen (**Allegations C and D, Abuse of Authority:** § 87(2)(g) PO Flores did not offer § 87(2)(b) medical attention regarding her involvement in the vehicle collision (**Allegation E, Abuse of Authority:** § 87(2)(g) PO Flores allegedly did not provide his name § 87(2)(b) (**Allegation F, Abuse of Authority:** § 87(2)(g) PO Flores left the scene without providing a business card to § 87(2)(b) (**Allegation G, Abuse of Authority:** § 87(2)(g)

There was no body worn camera (BWC) footage of this incident. The investigation obtained surveillance footage from Pioneer Market at 1150 Woodycrest Avenue [BR 3-5].

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation (A) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Jorge Flores stopped § 87(2)(b)

It is undisputed that PO Flores and PO Mauro saw § 87(2)(b) next to a parked vehicle and that PO Flores stopped her on suspicion of auto stripping. That § 87(2)(b) was urinating on the sidewalk next to the car is undisputed. It is also undisputed that § 87(2)(b) fled from PO Flores, who gave chase. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b) testified that while walking on West 167th Street towards Woodycrest Avenue, she stopped next to a parked car for approximately two minutes [BR 06]. Although § 87(2)(b) stated that she stopped to remove something from her bag, surveillance footage shows that she stopped to urinate on the sidewalk [BR 03]. § 87(2)(b) was wearing a white dress with shorts underneath, neither of which had pockets, and sandals. § 87(2)(b) had a small backpack with her. PO Flores and PO Mauro's vehicle stopped on the other side of the parked vehicle. PO Flores exited and began running towards her, and § 87(2)(b) ran away from him. § 87(2)(b) noted that she fled because she did not realize that PO Flores was a police officer.

PO Flores and PO Mauro testified that they were driving on West 167th Street, an area in which auto-stripping, the crime of removing parts from vehicles, is a chronic condition [BR 10, 11]. PO Flores clarified that it is common for individuals to steal parts from seemingly abandoned vehicles in parking lots and on sidewalks in that area. PO Flores and PO Mauro observed § 87(2)(b) pressed against a vehicle as if she was looking into it, and PO Flores suspected that she was attempting to strip the vehicle. PO Mauro added that § 87(2)(b) was "fidgiting" next to the parked vehicle, noting that § 87(2)(b) bent down as if she was putting something on the ground, and began walking away. PO Flores saw § 87(2)(b)'s backpack, which he noted could have had "any weapons" in it which could be used to break into vehicles. PO Mauro testified that he did not notice § 87(2)(b)'s backpack upon first seeing her. PO Flores did not suspect § 87(2)(b) of having

any specific tools in the bag. Neither PO Flores nor PO Mauro testified to seeing that § 87(2)(b) was urinating next to the car at the time. PO Flores informed PO Mauro of his observations and instructed him to slow down. PO Mauro added that, although he had no discussion with PO Flores regarding the decision to stop § 87(2)(b), he contributed to initiating the stop by stopping the car. As PO Flores approached § 87(2)(b), he stated, “Police.” § 87(2)(b) made a downward gesture, but PO Flores did not see whether she dropped anything. PO Mauro testified that § 87(2)(b) made the downward gesture and began walking away before PO Flores exited the vehicle to stop her. PO Flores cited the precinct conditions, § 87(2)(b)’s body language, and the downward gesture as the reasons he decided to initiate the stop. As § 87(2)(b) ran, PO Flores attempted to grab her, and § 87(2)(b) swung at him, brushing his right arm, before fleeing towards Woodcrest Avenue.

Stop Report § 87(2)(b) prepared by PO Flores regarding this incident is consistent with his testimony [BR 08]. The narrative regarding the stop notes that he observed § 87(2)(b) on a public sidewalk pressed against a parked vehicle and, upon PO Flores exiting his vehicle, § 87(2)(b) gestured downward and fled on foot. Body language, gesture, and concealing or possessing a weapon are listed as the factors that led to the stop. The narrative regarding the search notes that § 87(2)(b) was “in possession of a backpack that could be used to store weapons or burglar tools to commit the crimes of auto stripping/criminal possession of a weapon.” PO Flores noted in the report that the period of observation prior to the stop was one minute.

The investigation obtained surveillance footage from three different external cameras at Pioneer Market, all on West 167th Street. The first camera, the video from which is attached to IA 15, appears to be located on West 167th between Anderson Avenue and Woodcrest Avenue [BR 03]. Beginning at the 20 second mark, the footage shows § 87(2)(b) walking on the sidewalk from Anderson Avenue towards Woodcrest Avenue. § 87(2)(b) appears to have difficulty walking in a straight line, repeatedly stopping and stumbling in a way that indicates her intoxication. § 87(2)(b) is then seen stopping next to a black vehicle near the camera and crouching to urinate on the sidewalk. § 87(2)(b) faces away from the vehicle. § 87(2)(b) then retrieves what appears to be a packet of wipes from her bag, after which she drops one on the ground and moves out of frame. Seconds later, PO Flores and PO Mauro’s vehicle stops next to the vehicle by which § 87(2)(b) was standing, and PO Flores is seen exiting.

The second video, from IA 16, comes from a camera which appears to be located closer to the corner of West 167th Street and Woodcrest Avenue [BR 04]. In the video, after § 87(2)(b) urinates, she turns towards the vehicle as she retrieves the wipes from her bag. § 87(2)(b) faces the vehicle for a total of eight seconds before beginning to walk away (57 seconds to 1:04 minutes). PO Mauro and PO Flores’ vehicle appears in frame at 59 seconds and stops near § 87(2)(b) at 1:04 minutes. PO Flores exits the vehicle immediately after it stops and runs around the parked vehicle towards § 87(2)(b). As noted in PO Flores’ testimony, PO Flores reaches his hand towards § 87(2)(b) as he approaches, and § 87(2)(b) briefly extends her arm towards his shoulder to push him away before running towards Woodcrest Avenue. PO Mauro briefly exits his vehicle and watches PO Flores chase § 87(2)(b). PO Mauro then gets back in the vehicle and drives away in reverse.

The third camera appears to be located approximately 30 feet away from the corner of Woodcrest Avenue and faces the intersection of West 167th Street and Woodcrest Avenue [BR 05]. The footage is attached to IA 17. PO Mauro and PO Flores’ vehicle is seen turning right from Woodcrest Avenue onto West 167th Street at 24 seconds. § 87(2)(b) is seen running towards Woodcrest Avenue with PO Flores in pursuit at 37 seconds.

§ 87(2)(g)

According to NYPD Patrol Guide Procedure 212-11, a Level 3 Terry Stop requires reasonable suspicion, which exists when “the information known to the member of the service would

make an ordinarily prudent and cautious police officer under the circumstances believe criminal activity is at hand,” and requires articulate specific facts establishing justification for the stop [BR 12].

Both *People v Ferry*, 152 AD2d 952 [4th Dept 1989] and *People v De Bour*, 40 NY2d 210 [1976] maintain that innocuous behavior alone does not generate reasonable suspicion that a crime is at hand [BR 13, 14]. Furthermore, an individual’s mere presence in a high-crime area also does not constitute reasonable suspicion in the absence of some other indication of criminality, as noted in *People v Riddick*, 70 AD3d 1421 [4th Dept 2010] [BR 15].

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (B) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Jorge Flores threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (C) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Jorge Flores searched § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (D) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Jorge Flores damaged § 87(2)(b)’s property.

It is undisputed that PO Flores searched § 87(2)(b)’s bag after § 87(2)(b) provided consent. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b) testified that while running away from PO Flores, she ran across Woodycrest Avenue and was struck by a vehicle, which resulted in bruising to her left leg. She got up and continued running until she reached the other side of Woodycrest Avenue where several people were standing in front of a building [BR 06]. As PO Flores approached, § 87(2)(b) saw his vest and shield and realized that he was a police officer. PO Flores immediately told § 87(2)(b) to open her bag but did not say what he was looking for there. § 87(2)(b) asked why PO Flores had chased her, and he told her to give him her bag. PO Flores stated that he was going to “lock § 87(2)(b) up” for tampering with a car. PO Flores stated that the police had been receiving calls about individuals trying to break into cars in the area and that he knew § 87(2)(b) was “one of them.” § 87(2)(b) said, “That’s not true, but you can check my bag. I don’t have anything inside,” and handed her bag to him. PO Flores turned § 87(2)(b)’s bag upside down until all its contents fell onto the sidewalk. § 87(2)(b) had her wallet, pens, lipstick, a notebook, and her cell phone in the bag at the time. § 87(2)(b)’s cell phone screen cracked upon impact with the sidewalk. The investigation did not have sufficient information to identify or contact the bystanders

who may have witnessed the interaction.

PO Flores testified that, upon approaching § 87(2)(b) he asked why she was running from the police and what was going on [BR 10]. § 87(2)(b) apologized repeatedly and smelled strongly of alcohol. PO Flores explained that she was stopped for auto stripping and for the fact that she might be concealing a weapon. PO Flores then asked to search § 87(2)(b)'s bag. PO Flores noted that there was a possibility that § 87(2)(b) could be armed and dangerous. PO Flores did not recall whether he told § 87(2)(b) that she did not have to consent to having her bag searched. § 87(2)(b) gave verbal consent, although PO Flores did not specify what § 87(2)(b) said, and PO Flores took the bag placing it on the ground and kneeling to search it. PO Flores did not find anything in the bag. While PO Flores searched the bag, § 87(2)(b) made suggestions regarding compartments in the bag that he could search. PO Flores did not recall dumping the contents of the bag onto the street. § 87(2)(b) also explained that she had stopped to urinate and apologized, stating that she wanted to go home. In his CCRB interview, PO Flores noted that § 87(2)(b) could have been arrested for obstruction of governmental administration, resisting arrest, assaulting a police officer, public lewdness based on the fact that she had been urinating in the street, or public urination. PO Flores did not recall whether he told § 87(2)(b) that he would “lock her up.” PO Flores used his discretion and opted not to arrest § 87(2)(b). PO Flores noted that, although he was equipped with a BWC, it had not been docked properly for charging at the stationhouse and the battery had been depleted by the time the incident occurred.

In the Stop Report prepared by PO Flores, he noted that § 87(2)(b) gave consent for PO Flores to search her bag [BR 08.] He also listed § 87(2)(b)'s demeanor was “confused/intoxicated.”

PO Mauro testified that he joined PO Flores and § 87(2)(b) at the corner while they were speaking [BR 11]. PO Mauro did not hear what they were talking about and did not see whether PO Flores was searching for anything at that point. He did not hear PO Flores ask for permission to search for § 87(2)(b)'s bag and he did not see PO Flores do so. PO Mauro noted that § 87(2)(b) asked, “Can I go home?” but did not recall anything else she said. PO Mauro noted that § 87(2)(b) was intoxicated because her speech was slurred. PO Mauro then returned to the initial location of the stop, where he believed § 87(2)(b) had dropped something.

The surveillance footage from Pioneer Market did not clearly show § 87(2)(b)'s interaction with PO Flores on the opposite corner of West 167th Street and Woodycrest Avenue [BR 05].

NYPD Patrol Guide Procedure 212-11 states that, under a level 3 Terry Stop, an officer may request consent to search the stopped individual, and that the consent must be voluntarily given [BR 12].

People v Hill, 153 AD3d 413 [1st Dept 2017] notes that consent to search must be a free and unconstrained choice and that official coercion, even if subtle, nullifies apparent consent [BR 16]. Whether an individual's consent to search is voluntary is based on the totality of the circumstances, which include: whether the consent was given while the individual was in police custody; the personal background of the individual, including their age or prior experience with the law; whether the individual offered resistance or was cooperative; and whether the police advised the individual of their right to refuse consent.

The following sections of the NYC Administrative Code enumerate the criteria that officers must meet when seeking to consent to search a person, vehicle, or home [BR 23]. Valid consent to search requires that the officer:

NYC Administrative Code 14-173(a)(1) - articulates, using plain and simple language delivered in a non-threatening manner, that the person who is the subject of the search is being asked to voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently consent to the search, and explaining that the search will not be conducted if the person refuses to consent to the search;

NYC Administrative Code 14-173(a)(2) - must obtain consent without threats or promises of any kind being made to the individual;

NYC Administrative Code 14-173(a)(3) - must affirm that the individual understands the information communicated as per subsection (a)(1);

NYC Administrative Code 14-173(a) (4) - must refrain from conducting such search where consent has not been obtained; and

NYC Administrative Code 14-173(a)(5) - must utilize interpreter services as appropriate, including the use of bilingual officers and telephonic interpretation, when seeking consent from an individual who has limited English proficiency.

Additionally, according to NYC Administrative Code 14-173(b)(1), if the officer is equipped with a BWC, the officer must record the aforementioned presentation of the consent to search and the individual's response, whether or not the civilian consents (notwithstanding the other situations whereby officers equipped with BWC are required to record interactions with the public). Per NYC Administrative Code 14-173(b)(2), regardless of the officer having a BWC, the officer must properly document the time, location, and date of such search and the apparent race/ ethnicity, gender, age of the person who was the subject of the search and the officer's name, precinct, and shield number.

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

PO Flores stated that, once he initially approached § 87(2)(b) she was considered stopped and was not free to leave. § 87(2)(g)

PO Flores pursued § 87(2)(b) on foot for approximately half a block before allegedly requesting consent to search the bag. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b) and PO Flores stated that § 87(2)(b) ultimately gave her bag to PO Flores, § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b) did not testify that PO Flores informed her of her right to refuse consent, and PO Flores testified that he did not recall whether her informed her of her right to refuse.

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Although PO Flores was equipped with a BWC, he testified that the battery was depleted, and as such the consent was not recorded [BR 10]. Finally, PO Flores documented § 87(2)(b)'s consent in the stop report and in his memo book.

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Additionally, both PO Flores and PO Mauro noted that § 87(2)(b) was clearly intoxicated, as she smelled of alcohol and her speech was slurred. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Allegation (E) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Jorge Flores did not obtain medical treatment for § 87(2)(b)

Allegation (F) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Jorge Flores refused to provide his name to § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b)

Allegation (G) Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Jorge Flores failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.

It is undisputed that PO Flores did not obtain medical treatment for § 87(2)(b) nor did he provide his name or a business card. § 87(2)(g)

As previously noted, § 87(2)(b) testified that she was struck by a vehicle on Woodycrest Avenue while she fled from PO Flores. § 87(2)(b) sustained bruising to her left leg as a result of the collision [BR 06]. After PO Flores searched § 87(2)(b)'s bag, they both waited for several minutes until PO Mauro returned from canvassing the area of the initial stop. PO Flores did not offer § 87(2)(b) medical attention and she did not say that she had been injured by the vehicle that hit her. After PO Mauro returned and stated that he had not found anything, the officers stated that they would let § 87(2)(b) go. As PO Flores was walking away, § 87(2)(b) asked for his name and his precinct. PO Flores looked at § 87(2)(b) laughed, and walked away without answering her or providing any of his information. PO Flores was approximately one car length away from § 87(2)(b) when she asked for his information. Later that same night, § 87(2)(b) went to the 44th Precinct stationhouse with § 87(2)(b) where they spoke with PO Flores. § 87(2)(b) asked why PO Flores had not asked § 87(2)(b) if she was okay or offered her medical attention after she was hit by a car, and PO Flores stated that § 87(2)(b) did not say that she was hurt.

PO Flores testified that as § 87(2)(b) was running away from him, she crossed Woodycrest Avenue, and a car approached [BR 10]. § 87(2)(b) crossed the street and fell on the ground but immediately stood up again. PO Flores did not see the car hit § 87(2)(b) as he only saw the car approaching followed by § 87(2)(b) on the ground. PO Flores stated repeatedly in his testimony that he did not see § 87(2)(b) make contact with the car. PO Flores could not articulate whether he was looking away at the time or if the car never made contact with § 87(2)(b). PO Flores put his hands up so that he would not be accused of pushing § 87(2)(b). He then moved around the vehicle, which had stopped moving, and stopped on the corner where § 87(2)(b) was standing. PO Flores did not hear anything about § 87(2)(b) being hit by the

vehicle on Woodycrest Avenue until he spoke with her at the stationhouse later that night. PO Flores believed that if § 87(2)(b) had been hit by the vehicle, it would have been more reasonable to stay on the ground than to stand immediately as she had done. After the search occurred and PO Mauro stated that he had not found anything, PO Flores said, “Is there anything else you need from me?” to which § 87(2)(b) said no. PO Flores noted that the question was inclusive of but not limited to whether § 87(2)(b) needed his name, rank, command, a business card, medical attention, or a supervisor at the location. § 87(2)(b) asked repeatedly if she could leave. § 87(2)(b) did not ask PO Flores for his name or his business card. PO Flores spoke with § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) at the stationhouse later that night, during which § 87(2)(b) stated that a vehicle had struck her. Based on § 87(2)(b)'s complaint at the stationhouse, PO Flores prepared a police accident report regarding the collision, as well as a criminal complaint report regarding the driver leaving the scene.

Police Accident Report § 87(2)(b) prepared by PO Flores states that the driver of the vehicle involved in the accident fled the scene without exchanging information. The report notes that as § 87(2)(b) was crossing the street, the driver struck the left side of her leg, causing “complaints of pain and bruising.” Criminal Complaint Report #§ 87(2)(b) prepared by PO Flores contains the same narrative regarding where the vehicle struck § 87(2)(b) and her complaints of pain and bruising. The report notes that the driver then left the scene without exchanging information. Both reports note that § 87(2)(b) refused medical attention at the stationhouse.

PO Mauro testified that when he joined PO Flores and § 87(2)(b) it did not appear to him that § 87(2)(b) was injured [BR 11]. PO Mauro did not hear § 87(2)(b) ask PO Flores for any information nor did he recall hearing PO Flores explain the reason for the stop or offer any information to § 87(2)(b). PO Flores did not recall hearing PO Flores say, “Can I get you anything?” PO Mauro later learned that § 87(2)(b) may have been hit by a vehicle when § 87(2)(b) appeared at the stationhouse.

Footage from the third surveillance camera at Pioneer Market, attached to IA 17, shows PO Flores chasing § 87(2)(b) towards Woodycrest Avenue beginning at the 35 second mark [BR 05]. PO Flores' BWC falls off and he briefly stops to pick it up before continuing to pursue § 87(2)(b). As § 87(2)(b) runs across Woodycrest Avenue, a black sedan approaches from her left and strikes her. § 87(2)(b) is knocked off her feet and onto the hood of the car. § 87(2)(b) then slides off the hood of the car, appears to stop briefly on the other side, and continues to run. PO Flores appears to be facing § 87(2)(b)'s direction as she is struck by the vehicle but does not react and proceeds to run around the rear of the car to continue pursuing § 87(2)(b). The vehicle remains on scene for less than a minute before leaving.

NYPD Patrol Guide Procedure 217-01, regarding general procedure for responding to vehicle collisions, notes that officers must ascertain if there are any injuries and request an ambulance, if needed [BR 17].

NYPD Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09 states that officers must courteously and clearly state their rank, name, shield number and command, or otherwise provide them, to anyone who requests the officers to do so [BR 18].

New York City Administrative Code §14-174 outlines protocol for identification of all police officers engaging in law enforcement activities, including Level 3 stops, frisks, and searches of persons or property [BR 19]. In such cases that do not result in an arrest or summons, officers who conduct law enforcement activities must offer a business card to the person who is the subject of those law enforcement activities.

NYPD Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09 also addresses the provision of officer identification in law enforcement activities that do not result in arrests or the issuance of summonses, including frisks and searches of persons or property [BR 18]. In such cases, procedure states that officers must offer business cards upon the conclusion of law enforcement activities unless exigent circumstances are present.

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- This is the first CCRB complaint to which § 87(2)(b) has been a party [BR 20].
- PO Flores has been a member of service for six years and has been a subject in seven other CCRB cases with 12 allegations, four of which were substantiated.
 - Case 201608051 involved a substantiated allegation of refusal to obtain medical treatment. The Board recommended Charges, and the NYPD implemented formalized training.
 - Cases 201808686 and 201808753 involved substantiated discourteous language allegations. The Board recommended Command Level Instructions, and the NYPD has not yet imposed discipline in both cases.
 - Case 201901734 involved a substantiated allegation of threat of arrest. The Board recommended Command Discipline A, and the NYPD has not yet imposed discipline.
 - § 87(2)(g)

Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

- This case was not eligible for mediation.
- On April 22, 2020, a request was submitted to determine if a Notice of Claim was filed; confirmation from the Office of the New York City Comptroller will be forwarded upon receipt [BR 21].

- [§ 87(2)(b)] [§§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)]

Squad No.: 3

Investigator: Magdalena Azmitia Investigator Magdalena Azmitia July 7, 2020
Signature Print Title & Name Date

Squad Leader: Olga Golub SL Olga Golub 07/07/2020
Signature Print Title & Name Date

Reviewer: _____
Signature Print Title & Name Date